



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/932,515	08/17/2001	Jeffrey Jay Jacobsen	03424.P014	6329

8791 7590 08/14/2003

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, KIMBERLY D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2876

DATE MAILED: 08/14/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application N .

09/932,515

Applicant(s)

JEFFEREY JACOBSEN

Examiner

Kimberly D. Nguyen

Art Unit

2876

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —
Period of Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Amendment

1. Receipt is acknowledged of Amendment filed 2 June 2003.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 11 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. (US 5,545,291; hereinafter "Smith") in view of Suto et al. (US 4,746,787; hereinafter "Suto").

Smith teaches device comprising:

a first substrate (253 in fig. 4) coupled to a second substrate (257 in fig. 4);

the first substrate 253 comprising a plurality of display/driver/integrated-circuit blocks 19 which are deposited onto the first substrate (figs. 1-7; col. 5, lines 37-58; col. 6, line 15 through col. 8, line 10); wherein the blocks 19 in the substrate 253 comprising an integrated circuit or a liquid crystal display (col. 13, lines 47-64; col. 14, lines 26-30).

Although, Smith teaches a plurality of display blocks, he fails to teach or fairly suggest a dedicated integrated circuit coupled to the display blocks; the integrated circuit, which is configured to receive a signal from an external source; and a single I/O coupled to at least one display lock and a chip.

Suto teaches an IC card having an integrated circuit 2, which is configured to receive a signal from an external source by receiving/transmitting means 4, 5; wherein the integrated circuit 2 is coupled to a dedicated display 3 and controls input/output data displayed on the display 3 (figs. 1-2; col. 2, line 58 through col. 3, line 20).

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the data communication between an integrated circuit, the chip and an external source as taught by Suto to the teachings of Smith in order to provide a dedicated processor for every display block so that multiple images can be displayed simultaneously. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide blocks with display, integrated circuit and/or interface deposited onto the substrate due to the fact that it would be easier to manufacture the dedicated display block by the manufacturers (e.g., reduce processing time and to reduce the cost of manufacturing the display block). Furthermore, such modification would have been a mere duplication of elements as taught by Smith as modified by Suto for displaying multiple images, and therefore an obvious expedient.

4. Claims 2-10, 12-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith as modified by Suto as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Jacobsen et al. (US 6,281,038; hereinafter "Jacobsen"). The teachings of Smith as modified by Suto have been discussed above.

Re claims 2-4, 7-8, 10, 12, 14-18: Although, Smith disclose a substrate is selected from a group consisting of plastic sheet; Smith as modified by Suto fails to teach or fairly suggest the substrate comprises one of a flexible layer and a rigid layer.

Jacobsen teaches a flexible and/or rigid substrate applicable for fabricating the display thereon (figs. 9A and 14; col. 1, lines 17-26; col. 2, lines 14-33; col. 5, line 41 through col. 6, line 4; col. 7, lines 6-22; col. 8, line 42 through col. 9, line 11).

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the flexible and/or rigid substrate as taught by Jacobsen to the teachings of Smith as modified by Suto in order to provide greater support and durability to the dedicated display device within the card; therefore, an obvious expedient.

Re claims 5-6, 9 and 13: Jacobsen teaches a display generation substrate is coupled to an active matrix back-plane (fig. 8; col. 6, line 53 through col. 7, line 5).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments, "Thus, Smith did not teach, suggests, or motivate a first substrate coupling to a second substrate wherein the first substrate comprising a plurality of display blocks which are deposited onto said first substrate and an integrated circuit coupled to the display blocks...as claimed by claims 1, 11, 19, and 20" (see page 8, 2nd paragraph), filed 2 June 2003, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, 11, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Smith and Suto.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimberly D. Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-1798. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30-4:30.

Art Unit: 2876

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached on 703-305-3503. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-1341 for regular communications and 703-305-1341 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-8792.

KDN
July 31, 2003



MICHAEL G. LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800